

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office Action dated October 14, 2004, and the references cited therein have been carefully reviewed in light of the Examiner's helpful comments and suggestions.

As a result of the Office Action, claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b,e) as being anticipated by Greier. This reference has been carefully reviewed but is not believed to show or suggest Applicant's claimed invention in any manner. Reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims is therefore respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

By the above amendments, claim 1 has been amended to clarify the claimed invention. No new matter has been added. According to MPEP 2131, a claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. The Examiner has taken a position that "Greier discloses the claimed invention at Figs. 3 or 8, with first and second outer electrodes 2, 3, and first and second inner electrodes 10, or 4,5. In claims 2-4, some of the inner electrodes are formed on the same plane with others on different planes. In claims 5-8, the length has to be one of the other of smaller, greater or equal, as those are the only choices."

However, claim 1 requires "said first inner electrode and said second inner electrode are dimensioned and configured on a same plane wherein an electrode surface of said first inner electrode and an electrode surface of said second inner

electrode are in a non-facing relation to one another." Greier does not teach or suggest these limitations. The embodiments shown in Figures 3 to 8 of the Greier reference clearly show the inner electrodes 4 connected to terminal 2, inner electrodes 5 connected to terminal 3, which lie opposite and in a facing relations to one another. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the prior art.

Claims 2-8 are dependent from claim 1 and are therefore allowable for the reasons provided in connection with claim 1.

The prior art references made of record by the Examiner have each been considered but are not believed to obviate against the allowability of the claim 1 as amended. It is noted that none of these references have been specifically applied by the Examiner against any of the original claims.

Each issue raised in the Office Action dated October 14, 2004, has been addressed and it is believed that claims 1-8 are in condition for allowance.

Wherefore, reconsideration and allowance of these claims is earnestly solicited.

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,
DENNISON, SCHULTZ,
DOUGHERTY & MACDONALD

By: 

Amir H. Behnia
Reg. No. 50,215
(703) 837-9600 Ext. 16